DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 694 IR 057 909

AUTHOR	Merikangas, Robert
TITLE	A Brief History of the Management World of the UMCP Libraries.
PUB DATE	1996-00-00
NOTE	58p.; For related work, see IR 057 836.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Libraries; Higher Education; *Library Administration; *Library Administrators; *Library Directors; Library Planning; Library Policy; Library Services; Library Standards
IDENTIFIERS	*Library History; *University of Maryland College Park

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a brief history of the management of the University of Maryland at College Park (UMCP) Libraries. An Introduction addresses these questions: Why tell a history of the management of the Libraries? Why a history right now? What is the recommended methodology for creating a history of the management of a library? The paper consists of three main parts. Part One: General Time Line and Major Events, provides information on directors of the Libraries; major changes in the organization structure; evaluations; study of professional positions and the need for clerical support; Stress Intervention Program; Library Administrative Review Committee; Director's speech to staff (February 24, 1994); strategic planning; libraries in the campus strategic plan; vision for the Libraries; and selection of new director. Part Two: Selected Specific Management Issues focuses on budget; continuous quality improvement; electronic resources (computer files); friends of the Libraries; the undergraduate library; management training and development; personnel administration; staff and management-sponsored projects; Public Services Division organization and communication issues; relations with other campus libraries and collections; relations with UMS and various external groups; special services based in the Libraries; staff and user suggestions and complaints; staff organizations; and staff publications. Part Three: Interpretations and Questions that Arise from Reflection on the History identifies some questions for management to consider. (AEF)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 694

A Brief History of the Management World of the UMCP Libraries

By. Robert Merikangas

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.J. Merikangas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

IR057909

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A brief history of the management world of the UMCP Libraries

Robert Merikangas
September 1996/rev. Oct. 19, 1996

The work of the Libraries goes on, year after year, with the collections growing (and serials being cut), and users being helped. A number of the staff play management roles, and do not carry out direct functional tasks. Has their work been helpful? Could it be better? Perhaps a history of what management has done and not done might be useful?

Table of contents 1

INTRODUCTION 2
Why tell a history of the management of the Libraries? 2
Why a history right now? 4
What is the recommended methodology for creating a history of the management of a library? 5

PART ONE: GENERAL TIME LINE AND MAJOR EVENTS
Directors of the Libraries 6
Management team: A summary of major changes 6
Middle States self-studies and evaluations 11
External Review (1987) 11
Study of professional positions and the need for clerical support: The Costabile Report (1987) 12
Stress Intervention Program (1991-1992) 13
Library Administrative Review Committee, chaired by Dr George Callcott (1992-1993) 14
Director's speech to staff, Feb. 24. 1994 15
Strategic planning 16
Libraries in the campus strategic plan 18
UMS "Towards a State of Learning: Achieving the Vision III" 19
Selection of new director 19

PART TWO: SELECTED SPECIFIC MANAGEMENT ISSUES
Budget 20
Continuous Quality Improvement 20
Electronic resources (computer files) 26
Friends of the Libraries 28

UCC 3

Hornbake Library (Undergraduate Library) 28
Management training and development 30
Personnel administration 31
Projects: staff and management-sponsored 35
Public Services Division organization and communication issues 40
Relations with other campus libraries and collections 43
Relations with UMS and various external groups 46
Special services based in the Libraries 50
Staff and user suggestions and complaints 50
Staff organizations 51
Staff publications 53

PART THREE: INTERPRETATIONS AND QUESTIONS THAT ARISE FROM REFLECTION ON THE HISTORY 54
Some questions for management 55

INTRODUCTION

Why tell a history of the management of the Libraries?

We value history because it helps us understand our dynamic situation and so helps us in our deliberations about possible futures and about present decisions. Past, present, and future are linked, and so we tell our students and ourselves that ignorance of our common history will severely limit our capability to plan and execute decisions. We need to learn from the past because that past conditions the present, and may condition the future unless we gain understanding of the significance of past patterns and events.

If this is the case, why do we find little attention to institutional histories while there is great emphasis on political histories, on the large scale, and on personal histories, or biographies, on the individual scale? In fact, we do find institutional histories, especially business histories and histories of associations and agencies, but librarians for some reason have been less than energetic in creating institutional histories that go beyond histories of collections. As we librarians come to see the significance of the ways we organize and manage our libraries, and the consequent successes and failures of providing quality collections and services, we will undoubtedly tell each other our stories more frequently and more thoroughly.

One pressure for writing contemporary histories comes from the interest by the journalistic media in events of controversy and signficance. The

management of the Library of Congress has been of some public interest in recent years, and because of the public Congressional hearings, it is relatively easy for journalists to learn of controversial situtations and then to make inquiries. The stories of the management of academic libraries will often be of interest only when a scandal or crime occurs. And certainly the library administrators usually have no incentive to encourage the writing of histories, because the histories would put perhaps unwelcome attention on their mistakes as well as on their good deeds.

If one were to search a database such a Library Literature under a subject heading such as "academic and research libraries -- administration -- history" one would find few studies. An example of one is:

Kaplan, Louis. "On the road to participative management: The American academic library, 1934-1970. Libri 38 (Dec. 1988), 314-320.

Kaplan indicates the influence of some authors and the student unrest in the 1960"s, but notes that there was great resistance to participative management. He does not provide any substantial history other than some intellectual history.

Why are library school faculty and graduate students not writing histories and developing the capability in professionals to write their own histories? Perhaps we see here an agenda for those schools.

Do we need histories when we already have so much paper documentation on what is happening in academic libraries? Don't we have articles filling the professional journals? What about all the reports and statistics? The simplest answer is to ask in reply: what does all this documentation of programs, statistics, surveys, really tell us about what is happening and why it is happening in libraries? John McKnight, in writing about urban life, makes a point that applies equally well to other situations, including life in organizations:

> In universities, people know through studies. In businesses and bureaucracies, people know by reports. In communities, people know by stories. These community stories allow people to reach back into their common history and their individual experience for knowledge about truth and direction for the future. (The Careless Society, 1995, p. 171)

We can appreciate this when we see how someone coming into an organization such as a large library for the first time would proceed. Would such a person expect to learn a lot about the history and present situation

from studies and reports? Probably not. Such a person would talk to individuals and listen to their stories and try to piece together the strands of the common story.

This brief common story is the beginning of such a narrative, only the bare bones, and may serve to stimulate the memories of others, and encourage the telling of additional stories, leading to a more complete picture of the past. it might even be possible to go behind what was happening to what was really going on.

Even if a history might help us to understand a situation, does this translate into history having a role in helping us in problem solving? Yes, the management consultants tell us. Out of the large management literature, we select one article:

Mitroff, Ian I., and Ralph H. Kilmann. "Stories Managers Tell: A New Tool for Organizational Problem Solving." Management Review 64, 7 (1975):18-28.

Some points from Mitroff and Kilmann:

"If accounting and finance [libraries: read budget and collection acquisitions] are the backbone of organizations, then the stories which permeate all oranizations of any size are their lifeblood. Stories are so central to organizations that not only do organizations depend on them, but stronger still, they couldn't function without them. Big or small, every organization is dependent upon countless stories for its functioning." (18)

They outline how to gather data from managers and others who reveal different but complementary perspectives in the stories they tell.

"Storytelling, when applied in a problem-solving framework as we have described, can thus be an extremely important source of data for the organization -- data that would otherwide be ignored or overlooked. As such, storytelling procedures do become a new tool for organizational problem solving." (28)

Why a history right now?

This is a transition time for the UMCP Libraries, the end of the 20-year directorship of Joanne Harrar and the beginning, on October 1, 1996, of the deanship of Charles Lowry. It is also a transition time for the campus as a whole, with a new campus strategic plan, and the recruitment of a new provost. The new Library Council is going into a second year of oversight of

the Libraries, and a study is being done on library services to undergraduates which may lead to the resolution of long-standing questions. The general environment of higher education and libraries is in a condition of rapid change. We are being admonished to be engaged in "Choosing Our Future" (theme of ACRL 8th national conference in 1997), presumably before someone else does the choosing for us.

Instead of *planning* to get organized, we need to *get* organized. Understanding our history will help.

What is the recommended methodology for creating a history of the management of a library?

Because of the lack of good precedents, we have to say that the methodology is yet to be developed. This present essay may be taken as the beginning of part of the task, defining the content areas of possible interest. Since it is based on the personal archives and personal memory of one person, it is clearly inadequate. Systematic oral history would be a signficant part of any comprehensive history, as well as thorough study of reports and other records in the University Archives. The minutes of meetings would provide much useful information. Unfortunately, until recently there have been no minutes of Director's staff meetings. The presumably extensive documentation from the 1992 Administrative Review Committee (Callcott committee) is not available.

It might seem that a collective history might be composed of the many stories told about the people and their relationships. In fact, there is a growing literature about the methodology of studying the stories told in the workplace. For example:

Boje, David M. "The storytelling organization: A study of story performance in an office-supply firm." Administrative Science Quarterly 36, 1 (March 1991): 106-126.

"In organizations, storytelling is the preferred sense-making currency of human relationships among internal and external stakeholders." (106)

The history: This brief history is given in rather arbitrary segments, and I offer some personal interpretations of the history at the end. Additions and suggested corrections to the history and other interpretations are invited.

PART ONE: GENERAL TIME LINE AND MAJOR EVENTS

Directors of the Libraries: The Libraries have had directors who have served consecutive long terms: Howard Rovelstad for 29 years and then Joanne Harrar for 20 years.

Director: Howard Rovelstad (1946-June 30,1975) In his letter of resignation, Mr Rovelstad stated: "Now that the library's review and analysis program is completed this seems to be an appropriate time for another person to assume the leadership and responsibilities of the UMCP libraries and to carry out with the library staff the recommendations of the study."

The new director came in with the MRAP implementation in operation, but without a previous commitment to the process or its implementation.

MRAP: Management Review and Analysis Program: With the support of the Office of Library Management Studies of the Association of Research Libraries, a Management Review and Analysis Program Study Team was created of library staff, with nine task forces, and they submitted a report in September 1974.

Reading the recommendations in 1996 provides many good ideas.

Committees were formed to implement the recommendations, and a Committee "Z" to review the program of implementation.

Note: One of the recomendations was the clarification of services to graduates and undergraduates.

Director: H. Joanne Harrar (1975-1995)

As director Dr Harrar continued the implementation of the MRAP recommendations into 1976. The report of Committee "Z" in the LIbrary Record of October 29, 1976, gave a summary of what was done or underway. Shortly thereafter the implementation process as such was discontinued. The rest of this history deals with activities and events under her direction and in the year after her resignation, when the acting director was Dr Anne MacLeod, professor of the College of Library and Information Services.

Management team: A summary of major changes:

The director chose to work with a management group, or cabinet, which came to be called the Director's Staff, then the Director's Staff Group (DSG), consisting of the associate directors of public services, technical services

and automation, administrative services, special collections, and an assistant director for collection development. The titles and scope of responsibility have changed over time. The development officer has been added to the group.

The position of associate director, once held by Robert Pierson, formerly handled administrative and personnel functions. Now there is an adminstrative services division, with a personnel officer with a rank of Librarian II, and numerous other personnel staff. The security responsibility in the Libraries has been given as a contract to the Police on campus, who hire and supervise student assistants as police aides. The library staff observe their performance, especially at the entrances, exits of the libraries, but do not deal directly with observed problems and deficiencies. Recommendations for better training and supervision are regularly given to those running the police aide program. The most noticeable incidents are those when a library cannot open because no police aide has reported for duty at that site. The police aides and staff also are expected to enforce rules for users of the library, rules expressed in codes of conduct which are posted in the Libraries. Displays (by the Preservation Dept) on the harm done by theft and mutilation of library materials are mounted from time to time, and the illegality of the destruction of library materials is highlighted.

For a short time, years ago, the director had a librarian as an administrative assistant. There is a librarian position as administrative assistant to the AD for TS (that person will now be cataloging half-time). There has not been such a position in Public Services, but the AD has used other positions, such as the head of the General Reference/Resources department and the coordinator for library instruction, for doing administrative functions (dealing with reports, planning, personnel, campus communications, etc.)

The most significant changes in the organizational structure have been:

-making automation into a separate Information Technology Division

-reorganization of ITD by acting associate director Anthony Conto in 1996, after systematic interviews with the staff

-making the assistant director for collection development eventually into the associate director for collection management and special collections (while the associate director for special collections, Donald Farren, was on leave working at the Folger Library, his position was ended, and his division moved into the new division, reporting to Desider Vikor, associate director for colletion management; Farren returned to a position offered him as a rare book cataloger, but resigned that position rather promptly). When Thein Swe became associate director for collection management in 1982, he was

initially unaware that a complete collection policy (by the 1976 Committee to Formulate Book Selection and Collection Development Policies) had been prepared some years before. He created 5 task forces, including ones to develop collection development policy methods, and the use of statistics. When he was asked to leave, these projects had been dropped since 1985. In 1988 the new assistant (later associate) director for collection management set up subject clusters to coordinate collection work.

The East Asia Collection was in the Public Services Division, and in fact the former head of East Asia, Jack Siggins, became head of what was then called the Readers Services division. Later East Asia was moved to Special Collections, where it is now. The former head of East Asia, Frank Shulman, was removed from that position, and he now works as an assistant reference librarian in Government Documents, and reports the AD for PS. There was no public announcement as to the reason for his reassignment.

When the Undergraduate Library was opened in 1973, the head was a member of the director's cabinet. There was an assistant head (Barbara Manchak), and the head of reference and the head of Nonprint Media Services were Librarian IIs. When that head, Don Thomas, retired, the position of head was ended. Nonprint Media had already been placed directly under the associate director. Since then the Hornbake Reference unit has been in various places on the chart: in General Reference Department wih McKeldin Reference, and most recently in the department called Core Library Services, with Hornbake Circulation. When Irene Schubert resigned as head of Hornbake Ref, the position was reclassified from Librarian II to Librarian I. The first and only permanent head of Core Library Services was Virginia Massey-Burzio, who brought a plan for structuring a reference consultation service from her experience at Brandeis. She held planning discussions about the Hornbake service sites and their roles, but soon resigned to move to Johns Hopkins. Glenn Moreton, head of Circulation, was appointed acting head of Core Library Services. He continued to paly the role of head of Hornbake reference until in Sept. 1996 the ALII librarian from McKeldin Reference, Judy Markowitz, was asked to add 5 hours per week to her part-time schedule and serve as temporary head of Hornbake Reference (the vacant position not having been filled by a lengthly search).

The position of coordinator for library instruction was first created as reporting to the head of General Reference (although actually taking directions from the AD for Public Services), then moved to Core Library Services, then the line was lost, and the duties were abandoned or scattered. The recently created position of Manager of User Education Services restores

that function, and that position reports to the AD (it is not clear whether in the General Resources department or not). There was a coordinating committee for library instruction in the 1970s, and a general report was prepared, but the committee was dissolved and never reestablished. The AD for PS has not wanted to have a coordinating group, although the staff have requested one. A document of library instruction objectives was prepared (with categories for undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and staff), and the AD for PS took it to a faculty committee, but it has not been used for clarifying library goals (except for working with ENGL 101 instructors).

When Flora Jones, head of General Resources, retired, the position was not filled, but the department remains on the chart. When Denise Davis, coordinator of electronic reference services, left, the duties of that position were either dropped or absorbed by the AD for PS. The new position of manager of electronic information services (filled Sept. 3, 1996 by Betty Day, after grievance protests about the selection process as carried out by the AD for PS) reports to the AD for PS. The recently created position of telecommunications engineer in Public Services (held by Eddie Hou) also reports directly to the AD for PS.

Management of the General Resources department is nominally shared by the unit heads, with Terry Sayler, head of ILL, convening their unit heads meetings.

In McKeldin Library there were formerly separate reference rooms: General Reference, Humanities Reference, Social Sciences Reference and Goverment Documents, and Technology and Science Reference. The separate reference rooms were merged, and Government Documents and Maps made into a separate service site. More recently a map collection and service site has been set up (or down, if you prefer), in the basement of McKeldin, open only a few hours a day during the week.

The former Fine Arts room in McKeldin Library became the separate Art Library in the Art/Sociology building (and one of the branch libraries). The head of the Music Library, set up on the third floor of Hornbake, has reported directly to the AD for PS, and not to the head of branch libraries.

With the retirement of Herb Foerstel, head of EPSL and the branch libraries, the role of branch head is being reconsidered and it may continue to be rotated.

In Technical Services the former Serials Department was separated so that serials acquisitions and payments, serials cataloging, and serials adds, were put into units with the monographs. In reaction to problems coordinating the handling and workflow for serials, a team recently studied

the situation. It was understood that restoring a single department was not an acceptable solution, so the team recommended the designation of a serials coordinator (S. Palmiter was named) and a group created, composed of those in each TS department working with serials. Communications will be maintained with Public Services staff working with serials, including periodicals units.

The coordination of the ordering decisions for serials was formerly the responsibility of a Serials Review Board. With the reorganization of the Collection Management division and the creation of bibliographer positions, that group was ended. A draft policy on serials retention which had been begun was not brought to completion.

As mentioned, with the creation of bibliographer positions, the intention was that McKeldin and Hornbake reference librarians would no longer order for the general collections. Some reference librarians retained subject responsibility, but now only Martha Hooker in McKeldin is a selector (for education and physical education). Branch librarians continue to be selectors in their fields. There was the intention to have a bibliographer for the physical sciences and engineering, but it has not been possible to find and retain someone in that position.

The continued small number of bibliographers (when the orginal plan was to have 12) has created a major problem which has yet to be addressed. This situation is referred to the Collection Management and Special Collection goals for FY96 in these words: "Reexamine staffing needs for collection management and identify alternate strategies and organizational structures that will deal more effectively with available human resources and overall collection needs and priorities." In addition, there was the intention (stated in fall of 1991) to discuss (between divisions) the dual reporting of reference and branch librarians who do selection, but this has not yet happened.

Recently the AD for CM and SC declined an invitation to meet with the PSC (Public Services Committee). Desider Vikor wrote:

"The issues that were identified in the proposed agenda for a Collection Management/PSC discussion are admittedly very important and of concern to many of us. I seriously question, however, the appropriateness of PSC as the forum for discussing the future of Collection Management in general or the role of the bibliographers in particular. These issues speak to larger library priorities that need to be addressed by the senior administrative staff of the Libraries, including the Director. I respectfully decline your invitation to meet with you on such issues at this time."

With the new PRD (Performance Review and Development process),

appropriate sections of the expectations are handled by the separate supervisors.

The general policy is that only bibliographers do collection work, and bibliographers do not do reference or library instruction work. Bibliographers have served at the service desk in the Maryland Room when needed. Catalogers may volunteer to do catalog assistance work, and do VICTOR training classses, but not reference work and not collection development work.

With the loss of numerous staff lines in recent years, there has been mention of the possibility that lines would be moved to work areas of higher priority, by study and negotiation by the ADs.

Middle States self-studies and evaluations:

A complete history would require a summary of the Sparks committee report and its consequences from the 1960s.

1975 (10-year review): the need to continue to develop the Libraries was clearly stated.

1986 (10-year review): The Middle States Self-Study had chapter VI, "Library Resources." The recommendations included:

-give priority to support of academic programs

-get more funding to enhance collections, technology, and staff

-library planning should be more integrated into campus planning

Middle States Review Committee on the Library, 1992 (five year review) See the report.

1996: CQI-style task forces set up in the spring of 1996 to prepare recommendations. No particular attention paid to the Libraries. When Danuta Nitecki, acting as facilitator for the task force on undergraduate educaction, suggested that the Libraries might be relevant, she was asked to make a contribution. She had to decline since her role was facilitator, not team member.

it would seem to an observer that the Middle States process has had no distinguishable effect on library management, but justifying this judgment would require extensive research.

External Review (1987)

An external review of the Libraries was conducted on Sept. 9 and 10, 1987, by a team consisting of Murray Martin (Tufts University library), Michael Gorman (Univ. of Illinois) and Henrietta Avram (Library of Congress). Copies to their report were distributed to middle managers on March 14, 1988, and put on reserve for the staff. The Director commented: "I think this is an important document and one which we should use to the betterment of the Libraries in every way we can." The full report should be read, and if it is, it becomes clear that very little was done afterwards to implement the recommendations included in it. There is no evidence that it was used as a checklist for planning and action and follow-up. The major change that came after the report was the reorganization of collection management and the creation of a cadre of bibliographers. The discussion of library management concluded: "On the whole the library is rather under-managed than is necessary for its complexity." (p. 32) Some other points:

"Clearer lines of responsibility are needed, along with greater acceptance by the staff of dual reporting needs. Clearer rules for decision-making are needed and more careful ways of disseminating information about those decisions."(p. 32)

"Directors Meeting should assume more responsibility for leadership and act as a cabinet, rather than seeking to increase individual authority." (p. 33)

Is it interesting from the vantage point of 1996 to see these recommendations:

"-The organizational relationships of the branch libraries should be revised.

-Consideration should be given to incorporating the library school library into the library system.

-The service needs of undergraduate students should be studied and the necessary changes made." (p. 2)

Study of professional positions and the need for clerical support: the Costabile Report (1987)

On October 11, 1985, the director wrote a memo to her staff re: Analysis of professional positions. She stated a concern that the Libraries needed to improve the quality and productivity of current operations, and also "take on new services, especially those associated with the newer technologies." To deal with this problem, with no new positions expected (and of course the Libraries lost many positions), she proposed the analysis of positions:

"(1) to ascertain what each of our professional positions <u>in fact</u> entails, not just what the position description says it entails; (2) to ascertain what

elements are professional in nature and what ones are not; (3) to determine what non-professional elements can realistically be stripped out and reassigned to other levels of personnel or contracted out, or even eliminated altogether; (4) to develop, as a result, revised positions and job descriptions." The goal was to complete this process by June 30, 1987.

The specific visible result of this management initiative was the hiring of Sal Costabile and Associates to do a study, which resulted in the Costabile Report. A Public Services Staff Forum was held on Nov. 13, 1987, with about 25 people present, to discuss the report. The report of that forum shows that the staff were highly critical of the methodology and results of the study.

The report seemed to be based on the compilation and interpretation of interviews of staff. Many of the interpretations and recommendations seemed in error and superficial. The key fact was that the recommendations were not the subject of deliberation by the staff with the greatest knowledge of the situations.

The final paragraph of the Public Services report stated:

"When asked what was good in the report, the forum participants acknowledged the possible need for an outsider to state the obvious, but expressed disappointment that points useful for political advocacy were not made more strongly. Increased staff - especially clerical support - is repeatedly implied but could be amplified. To be a dynamic instrument for seeking support for Libraries, this report should be edited to synthesize observations and opinions into substantiated recommendations. Instead, some of its superficial comments, its mixture of significant issues with the trivial, and its lack of clear distinction between voiced opinions of a few and writtten conclusions of fact make the report vulnerable to criticism and weaken the authors' credibility with some of the project's participants."

The effort to provide increased support for professional positions seemed to lead to nothing. However, some management positions have been given up as lines have been lost.

Stress Intervention Program (1990-1991)

In response to a perceived severe morale problem, the director called on the assistance of Tom Ruggieri from the counseling staff of the Health Center to give programs on how to deal with stress. He also held sessions that sought to identify the reasons for stress in the library environment, with the

assumption that action might be taken.

In a memo to the staff from the Director dated 23 April 1991, H. Joanne Harrar wrote:

"During the past Fall and Spring the Libraries began a process of self examination. Most of the Libraries' mid-level managers attended a series of strss management sessions which proved worthwhile for those involved and very informative to me. Through these exchanges, many issues were raised, discussed, and several were identified for further study and action. Some of the concerns raised have been deferred to the Libraries' strategic planning process, which is about to get underway and others were referred to the Director's Staff and the Library Personnel Office for further investigation. As a direct result of these sessions, a series of Director's Forums are being scheduled which will promote more informal and direct communications between the staff and myself."

Further workshops for all the staff were held in May and June 1991.

The Director meet for a time with small groups of staff in the Director's Forum series. It did not seem that major issues or resolutions were raised, and soon the series was stopped.

The document which identified "Stressors within Library as Expressed by Mid-Level Managers" listed a number of items relating to management, which may be sumarized as lack of participation in decision making, need for management training, and lack of coordination and strategic planning.

It appeared that the director referred consideration of any steps to improve management to the associate directors, but no specific steps were taken.

Library Administrative Review Committee, chaired by Dr George Callcott (1992-1993):

The library staff received a memo dated Nov. 2, 1992, which stated, in part: "As a capstone on these reviews and evaluations, Vice President Goldhaber has appointed the present Administrative Review Committee to review the reports of the recent past, to consult with faculty and with the library staff, and to make recommendations concerning the library's leadership.

"This letter, then, is an invitation to all members of the library staff to express themselves on this matter, either by letter or in direct testimony."

On Nov. 20 Callcott sent a second letter to the library staff. It stated, in part:
"My earlier letter about the Library Administrative Review raised some questions, and so I would like to elaborate. . . . The primary charge of this committee is to gather the information necessary to assess Dr. Harrar's leadership in the past and present and to make recommendations about the future direction of the libraries."

Library staff submitted written comments and appeared in person to testify before the committee on Dec. 11, 1992. Faculty also testified.

The committee prepared a report for the vice president and provost. It was at this time that the newly appointed vice president for academic affairs and provost, Daniel Fallon, was coming to campus. The content of the report was not made public, and Fallon made no announcements concerning the Director.

When the Director, Joanne Harrar, announced her resignation as director and move to the position of executive director of the project of preparation for the Performing Arts Library, many assumed that she was persuaded to relinquish the management position to allow someone else to be appointed. Her intention to remain on the staff until reaching the retirement age of 65 appeared to be the result of an arrangement with the provost. It was understood that her salary would remain the same, but no announcement was made about that.

Director's speech to staff, Feb. 24, 1994:

The director had last given a "state of the libraries" speech in fall of 1992. This speech was intended to be more than a report: it was intended to open up dialogue with the staff about important things. Some of the topics:

-We will put into practice greater involvement of staff in decision making, in accordance with campus policy of shared governance. [no visible action taken]

-A committee will be established to design a merit award process so staff will be more comfortable with it. [used one year, not this past year]

-Efforts will be made to push the proposed policy on librarians at the system level. [no results visible yet]

-One clear salary inequity is between librarian salaries and data processing salaries: should we write librarian positions as data processing?

[McKeldin reference librarians are requesting upgrade of classification from ALII to LibI, same as bibliographers]

-Director is delighted that the Librarians' Forum is getting started, and will work with it, to share information and solve problems. [Forum has ceased]

-We need more systematic staff training; staff need to give feedback. [no systematic program yet]

-We will have systematic overview of TQM/CQI. [overview given, action ceased]

-Space is a serious problem; we will examine off-campus storage space and eventual on-campus storage. [no storage space yet; Hornbake being used]

-The study of undergraduate services has been postponed; the provost wants the issue referred to the Library Advisory Committee. This issue will not be lost; action will be taken this spring. [no action was taken]

-A new Library Council is being created. I hope it will be an advisory committee, not an oversight committee. [It was designed to be an oversight committee]

-We are considering joining RLG. [we joined, then dropped membership about a year later]

-There will be a massive campus effort toward planning led by the new provost. [This was done, then the provost resigned]

-There is a student advisory committee [this ceased without notice]

Strategic planning:

The Libraries had been submitting annually-updated five-year plans for many years, and the general impression was that these documents were only exercises in report writing. Then in 1991 a Steering Committee, chaired by Danuta Nitecki, was created to produce a strategic plan for the Libraries. The committee did some questionnaires, asking constituent groups to comment on existing and preferred levels of service with numerical ratings. In April 1993 a March draft strategic plan was released to the staff and the campus, and comments were requested by April 23. A meeting on the plan was held for the staff on April 5, 1993. At the same time a plan, "Computing in the Libraries" by Ron Larsen, dated Jan. 28, 1993, was made available as approved by the Director. The two plans were not integrated.

The strategic plan identified areas for action, but did not deal with organizational structure or management means to carry out the goals.

The next step in the strategic planning process was in response to the new

provost's request for strategic plans from all major academic divisions and departments. As a part of the planning process the Libraries held an all-day retreat on Nov. 18, 1994, at the Center of Adult Education, facilitated by Geno Schnell. Groups came up with lists of ideas, in reaction to questions:

-What should we do which we are not doing now?

-What are we doing which we should give up?

-If we have no additional resources, how do we achieve our goals?

The lists were ranked, but there was no time for deliberation.

A new plan was quickly written, and submitted to Provost Fallon on Dec. 19, 1994. A copy was given to library staff, with this comment by the Director: "The plan itself is only the first step in an ongoing planning process which we will be establishing in the coming months. Too, the plan will be subject to continual modifications and one hopes, improvements."

Each college and department gave a presentation of its plan to the president. The Director gave the Libraries' colorful presentation on March 15, 1995. The emphasis was on the need for more funding to catch up with libraries of peer institutions.

Some of the bulleted items:

- zero-base every collection policy, restrict to core
- matching funds for departmental desires beyond core
- build barterable information resources
- develop alternative funding sources
- engage faculty & library staff creatively

Near-term priorities:

- challenge: increase and improve user access to information . . . regardless of medium
- opportunity: build the electronic library
- necessity: enhance library support for undergraduate education

The presentation concluded with "agile" slogans and watchwords.

Some of the questions asked after the presentation show areas of leadership interest:

-how did we improve in ARL rankings while funding declined? Answer: we added microform holdings

-how can we use the National Archives?

-are periodicals moving to electronic versions? what are barriers?

-is the LIMS a success? we expect to be with CARL for 5 more years

-are there collections at other campuses of value to us?

-what are the advantages of the UMS library system?

-do we see more library use?

There has been little mention of the strategic plan since the presentation. The strategic plan included possibilities for a number of new cooperative intitiatives, with no indication of the availability of staff time for them.

Libraries in the campus strategic plan:

In the spring of 1996 the campus strategic plan was completed. On Feb. 22, 1996, President Kirwan forwarded the plan to the College Park Senate's executive committee. A draft was published in Outlook on March 5, 1996. In that version the Libraries were mentioned:
"Charge the incoming Director of Campus Libraries to develop a plan for addressing and correcting existing deficiencies in campus library collections through the creative utilization of existing area resources, electronic consortia, and other emerging information technologies."

The chair of the Library Council, Gerald Miller, responded to the Senate concerning the plan in a memo dated March 7, 1996. In the memo he challenged the Senate to say more about the Libraries. Specifically, he asserted: "Rather than imply that the new Library Director must be a miracle worker, or a leech, a commitment should be made in the Plan to support this central resource on which all our academic programs depend."

In a revised version delivered by President Kirwan it was stated that one specific step should be:
"Develop and implement a set of strategies that will enable the Campus Library System to begin to correct some long-standing deficiencies in monograph holdings, serials, and staffing. While this will inevitably require some increases in funding for the library, it will also be necessary to capitalize on existing information-technology expertise to gain increased access to research materials located at other sites. In addition, library operations and policies will need to be closely coordinated with current academic priorities in all parts of the campus. Although correcting current deficiencies in the Library System exceeds our current financial capabilities, the provision of a set of library resources capable of meeting the needs of students and faculty in all units must remain one of the institution's most important goals."

Elsewhere the plan emphasized the need to train undergraduate students in the use of information resources and technology.

In the alumni newsletter later (summer 1996 issue), President Kirwan commented: "Another measure of our academic stature is the strength and depth of our library holdings. During the next several months, strategies will be developed to address the funding needs of the library for staff, equipment and acquisitions." [the staff have not heard of these strategies].

In September 1996 the president sent a summary of the strategic plan to the faculty and staff, and that short version included the intention to increase funding for the Libraries.

UMS "Towards a State of Learning: Achieving the Vision III"

In 1995 UMS Chancellor Langenberg promulgated Vision III, which includes a 20-percent increase in academic and administrative productivity by the year 2002. Definitions of productivity are needed to make the measurements. We have not yet seen movement on defining productivity for the Libraries. Some faculty have expressed concern that the definitions of productivity will define our core work and drive all funding. Will the most essential services be included, or just the ones most oriented to technology?

The use of productivity measures for Libraries would presumably parallel the interest of Middle States in measuring the use of the Libraries for student learning as well as volume counts and transaction counts.

Selection of new director:

A public forum was held by the selection committee for a new director in McKeldin Library on January 31, 1996. The search committee, chaired by Dean Ira Berlin, informed the staff of the process and asked for input. The staff were told to tell the truth to candidates, being positive about the opportunities and hopes here, and not concealing our problems, being honest about pluses (such as location and great staff) and minuses (such as money).

Some staff gave written comments and suggestions to the search committee.

Forums were also held with faculty to obtain their ideas of the qualifications needed by the new director.

Part II: Selected specific management issues:

Budget:

The budget has been constant for many years, so with increase in inflation the purchasing power has gone down. This is especially noticable in materials, with the impact of increases in serial prices. The first sign of a change is the notification in the early summer of 1996 that the serials cancellations planned for FY 97 will not be needed, as a result of arrangements for augmentation to the budget by the new dean. In addition, the dean has been asked to prepare systematic budget proposals by March 1997.

In September 1996 a number of scientists, including Dr Stephen Brush (who had prepared the Brush Report of recommendations on the libraries some years ago), sent a letter to President Kirwan and to the chair of the Campus Senate, Dr Anderson, requesting that the percentage of indirect cost/overhead money (DRIF) with government grants and contracts which is allocated to the Libraries be examined and increased. It was understood that President Kirwan responded favorably to this request. In addition, Dr Brush continued to try to obtain reports on the allocation and use of the DRIF funds.

The funds received from University College have also been the subject of discussion for years. Several years ago the Libraries began charging the librarians and faculty of University College for the use of College Park library rooms for library instruction and for classes in Nonprint Media Services.

There have been calls for program budgeting, but no action taken in this direction.

Full details of the budget are not routinely given to the staff

The print-out of the general line budget is available in the Maryland Room.

What happens to the money from fines? It is generally understood that the Libraries retain little of it.

There is a profit from the photocopy services, and that money is used to fund a number of library staff positions. Information on this is not released to the staff, so that the information does not leak so that other campus departments do not become concerned.

Continuous Quality Improvement:

Beginning in 1988 the UMCP campus began investigating the use of Total Quality Management. Over the next few years managers from campus units received training. The director and associate directors were included in this training, but they did not find any basis for further action in the Libraries.

National TQM in libraries conference, Washington, DC, April 1994: a small number of staff, including the AD for PS, attended this conference and reported on what they had learned in a program for the staff. Those reporting on May 9, 1994 were Betty Day, Heidi Hanson, Bob Merikangas, and Danuta Nitecki. They had learned about the experiences of libraries at Univ. of MIchigan, Wayne State, Indiana, Arizona, Duke, and elsewhere.

General staff orientation to CQI: on July 6 and July 19, 1994, Geno Schnell associate director of CQI on campus, gave an overview of CQI (as the campus calls TQM) to interested staff. In his presentation he focused on three areas:

customer service
total involvement
process management

He began with a short quiz, which showed how little the staff know about "the big picture" of the campus and the Libraries.
In small group discussions associate directors were present, which situation some found helpful, and others found inhibited free discussion. Geno later reported on evaluations by giving a summary of comments from the two sessions.

"Introducing Continous Quality Improvement in the Libraries" -- In a memo to all library staff on Sept. 16, 1994, the director announced the beginning of CQI systematically in the Libraries, and asked the staff to vote on a list of 10 possible topics for action. The topics:

1. communication
2. electronic resources and the selection process
3. services to undergraduates
4. staff suggestion process/system
5. services for electronic resources
6. public printers
7. staff orientation program
8. serials management process
9. recognition of staff

10. shelf availability of materials

She offered this general overview:

"Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) offers us in the Libraries the potential for dealing effectively and efficiently with many of our universal concerns, including: gaining a better understanding of the desires and needs of our patrons, both external and internal, and improving our interactions and services accordingly; identifying and solving both inter- and intra-divisional issues through team action and through employment of methodologies and strategies common to the CQI "toolkit"; empowering staff, enabling you to play key roles in the decision-making and implementation processes necessary to the ongoing betterment of the library system."

It was decided to create two official CQI teams:
Internal Communications, chaired by Anne Turkos and sponsored by the director, and Shelf Availability, chaired by Phil Vandermeer, and sponsored by the AD for PS. Staff were invited to volunteer to be on a team by responding to the director by Jan. 4, 1995

Internal Communication: The team responsible for this study surveyed the staff for ideas, and invited contributions. They had support from Geno Schnell in the use of CQI problem solving methods, and they developed a systematic set of recommendations to improve communications. The proposals were coded as S = begin with 3-6 months, M = begin with 3-9 months, L = begin within 3-12 months. At a staff forum in July of 1995 the staff present were asked to put colored dots on recommendations to show their preferences for priority action. The team had noted that action had already begun on some proposals, such as a revised staff newsletter.

The four major areas of recommendation were:

1. Strengthen and expand communication between and among divisions/departments to overcome a sense of isolation and inequity.
2. Make available and encourage job and communication skills training.
3. Utilize a management philosophy which empowers employees and promotes trust.
4. Increase effectiveness of communication channels.

The team reported to the staff which of the recommendations received the most points in the forum session.

Soon after this process it was announced that the sponsor of the team, the director of Libraries, was stepping down. She discussed the recommendations with the ADs and reported their reactions to the team's work in an e-mail memo to the whole staff dated 1 Sept. 1995. She mentioned that "their [ADs]

general position, I believe it fair to say, is that attention should at least initially focus on those recommendations given the most weight by the staff. Such attention, however, may in some cases take the form of an expression of sensitivity to the problem described rather than immediate or near-term action."

The many recommendations on staff development were to be referred to a mini-CQI team under the sponsorship of Gary Kraske. Such a team was finally set up, and gave a report (see below, under Personnel).

The response to many of the other recommendations was that the ADs saw no real problem, nothing more needed to be done, or it would be up to staff initiative to do things, or it would take too much time.

No comment was made on the recommendation that "training should be provided for all responsible staff on the techniques for conducting meetings."

The concept of a change in management philosophy apparently did not elicit any positive reaction from the ADs.

The general impression of the staff (Sept 1995) was that nothing much would be done, and a year later (Sept 1996) the impression was that nothing much had been done, and that no specific attention was given by the ADs to the recommendations, except for the formation of the team on staff development.

In September 1996 the former members of the team met with the acting director to get ideas on what the next steps might be with the new dean coming.

Shelf availability: A team chaired by Philip Vandermeer and sponsored by Danuta Nitecki was charged to work 120 days and make recommendations. Their proposals were reported in a staff forum on June 21, 1995. In an e-mail memo on Sep. 7, 1995, to the library staff the director relayed a memo by Nitecki on the recommendations.

Some proposals implemented:

-some reference secondary locations (such as MCKREF QCKREF were added); locations in alcoves were not added

-a signage team was formed, which in turn made signage recommendations (there had been a signage committee created by Nitecki in 1993, but there

had been no follow-up on their recommendations for McKeldin; the new group was asked to refer to the work of the earlier committee)

-phones were installed in the McKeldin stack lobbies (and after many months were labelled to show their function)

-a forum for the staff on circulation, supposed to be held by July 1996, is to be scheduled in the future (fall 1996)

There has been no report on the key task of monitoring reshelving turn-around time.

Other teams were formed in the Libraries, not considered official CQI teams, and often called quasi-CQI teams. In Public Services two teams were formed in the late summer of 1994, and completed their work and reports by the spring of 1995.

-User Education team: this group recommended beginning workshops to teach basic VICTOR as a pilot part of a comprehensive user education program. The VICTOR workshops have continued as a separate operation under the direction of the AD for PS, and the more comprehensive program has not yet been addressed, except as a goal for the new manager of User Education Services.

-Hornbake Desk Instructional Services Team: this group provided service at Hornbake Information/Reference desk, and made recommendations. They recommended moving all reference librarians to McKeldin for general reference service (perhaps at a new supplemental service site) and the continued development of the training methods and materials they had developed for training desk staff to give VICTOR and related instruction. There was no action on either recommendation.

Other issues were addressed in a variety of ways:

-serials management: the AD for TS appointed a group to study the problems of communications and operations concerning serials. There had been a series of serials meetings called by TS for Public Services staff dealing with periodicals and other serials. Major changes in recent years had been the move to centralized check-in instead of check-in at each branch location, and online check-in using the serials records in CARL. In a memo to TSD staff dated April 16, 1996, Marietta Plank announced the formation of a TSD Serial Group, chaired by Sherry Palmiter, head of serial acquisitions, and the UMCP Serials Group, also chaired by Sherry. Arlene Klair was made responsible for the overview of all documentation.

-electronic services: plans for new technology and the creation of a LAN

-electronic resources and the selection process: Desider Vikor appointed an

inter-divisonal task force to propose a process for the selection of electronic resources. The recommendation of the task force was presented to the Director's Staff Group
-public printers: plans for printers have been discussed in the Public Services Committee for PS sites. Plans for a possible cost-recovery system and the removal of printers so that patrons will download instead have been discussed but not implemented.
-staff orientation program: Gary Kraske asked Ray Foster, head of Personnel, to prepare a staff orientation program. The program as it now exists consists in a packet of information given to each new staff member, and a tour of the Libraries given for new staff at intervals.

Review of CQI situation: In the spring of 1996 a general training session for library staff in CQI techniques was held. Under the direction of Geno Schnell, the staff who could attend used the Nominal Group Technique and other techniques used by CQI teams to consider and problem-solve the general question: "What are the greatest challenges the Libraries must face if it wants to implement CQI?"

Reports from the groups appeared in Library Matters, including the March 8, 1996, issue. Some extracts from one team's deliberations:
Challenges: cynicism that CQI works, lack of staff/ resources/money, competitive attitude between departments/divisions, existing hierarchical structure, lack of training for all employnees, lack of faith that management will follow through, lack of staff acceptance for implementation of changes, difficulty of quantifying much of what we do, lack of clear mission goals.

Voted most significant was: lack of faith that management will follow through.

Present situation (September 1996): When Dr Harrar resigned as director, the questions became: what will happen with the implementation of the recommendations of the team she sponsored, on Internal Communications, and what would happen with the CQI program in general. Some events:

-a new CQI team was formed by Gary Kraske, AD for Admin, to deal with the issue of staff training and development, an area in which the Internal communications team made recommendations. This team, chaired by Arlene Klair of Technical Services, include Lupe Fernandez of the Personnel office. The long-time director of staff development in the Personnel office, Kathryn Fitzgibbons, was not appointed to the team. Fitzgibbons later left the Libraries under terms of an agreement which precluded any announcement or

information to the staff. This left the position vacant, and any new appointment to a newly-defined position dealing with staff training and development was postponed until the arrival of a new director. The report was dated May 15, 1996. No action has been taken.

-it was stated (see the minutes of the director's staff) that the Web Editorial Board, sponsored by the AD for PS, would be transformed into a CQI team. When the board made its first year report to the staff in the summer of 1996, the AD for PS stated that new members would be added to the board. No mention was made of any CQI aspect to the operations of the board. As one of her last actions, Nitecki replaced two of the key members of the board, Joe McHugh and Judy Din (these members, who probably would have been quite pleased to continue and use their expertise, perhaps felt that they were being penalized for good work, rather than rewarded). A facilitator, Philip Vandermeer, was appointed to the new "team," with the sponsor being the new dean (Phil had begun meeting with the board earlier; it was perceived that the assignment of a facilitator was in reaction to problems that had ceased when a member from ITD had left the staff). It thus appeared that there is an intention that there be a CQI aspect to the workings of the group. If so, it would be the first time that an ongoing work group would try to work as a CQI team. There has been no announcement of any training for that process for either the leader, the facilitator, or the members.

During the year of being acting director, Dr Anne MacLeod led the ADs through a listing of library services and activities, according to the minutes of the Director's Staff Group. The results of this overview have not been shared with the staff.

Electronic resources (computer files): The management of the selection and ordering of computer files has been complex over the years. The following is a brief summary.

For many years a separate budget line was set aside for machine-readable files. The Public Services coordinator of electronic reference resources, most recently Denise Davis (until she resigned and the position was left open), handled the obtaining of the reference titles, the documentation, and chaired an Automated Reference Sources (ARS) group of representatives of public service sites with computer files. More recently, a committee was set up by Desider Vikor, the AD for CM and SC, to set up a process for approving purchase of computer files. That study group proposed setting up a new committee, which has been established: the Electronic Resources Review Committee (ERRC). That committee has prepared forms supplementing the basic materials request form for selectors and bibliographers to use to

recommend new electronic titles. Computer files now come out of the same budget lines as print materials, whether serials or single-purchase items.

The complexities derive in part from the variety of persons and entities involved in making proposals and decisions concerning computer files. Some are the following:

CARL databases: some selected by the UMS directors as a whole. The new PsycLit file was designated by them for use with the new INQUERY search engine.

CARL databases for specific campuses: The ?remote command in VICTOR shows which campuses make available which databases. Campus library directors decide which ones to subscribe to. ERIC: apparently continued by decision and funding by ITD after UMCP library staff suggested dropping it. BIP: new subscription begun in 1996, with cooperation from the UMCP University Book Center, and cancellation of all print and CD-ROM copies.

RLG databases using Eureka: Selected by the UMCL Libraries director, in consultation with staff? A training password is needed when a class is to be instructed, since there are few simultaneous ports.

FirstSearch databases. Some are selected to be available on the VICTOR menu, and are paid on a subscription basis, with a specific number of ports available for simultanous users. Other files are on per-search basis, at 3 specific workstations. An additional password is needed when a class is to be instructed.

Lexis/Nexis database: the continuation of educational contract is handled by the AD for PS.

Commercial CD-ROM databases: new ones selected using the ERRC process. Require reference head recommendation if reference titles.

Government documents computer files: come to McKeldin as regional depository. Workstations for making them available are the responsibility of the PS Division.

EBSCOhost databases: selected by the ERRC for general campus use (process not clear).

DIALOG databases: Provided to participating UMS campuses as a DIALOG CIP project, with 3-year funding, ending June 1996. The origins of the project were never clear to UMCP library staff, but it appeared to be arranged by Ron Larson of ITD. A new UMS libraries committee (UMCP representatives, Betty Day and contract librarians Maggie Cunningham) is charged with recommending databases for UMS undergraduates generally. They (Michael Romary, chair) have asked for an extension to mid-December 1996 to make a recommendation.

PsycLit with web access using INQUERY search engine: This is a project apparently connected to the selection of CARL databases, decided on when it was realized that the CARL search engine was completely inadequate for the PsycLit database.

Procedures are being worked out for making decisions on where the computer files will be made available: stand-alone workstations in one or more sites, only on ERR workstations, on the LAN called the Electronic Information Connection (in all sites or selected ones), linked on the web site, on the VICTOR menu. It is becoming an assumption that all library-owned or accessed computer files should be cataloged. Presently not cataloged:

DIALOG files
FirstSearch files
CARL databases
GPO access databases (listed but not correctly)

A major issue could the continuation of the CARL databases, which share the search engine limitations of the CARL library online catalogs. The understanding is that the CARL contract is continuing indefinitely.

At present there are over 20 different search engines being used in reference (bibliographic and non-bibliographic) computer files in UMCL Libraries.

Friends of the Libraries: When the part-time director of development, Mary Holland, was hired, it was understood that the staff would be highly involved in the fund-raising process, and that a Friends of the Libraries group would be created. Holland met with a number of staff groups to encourage them to be involved. After many years, it seems that an official Friends of the Libraries is about to be formed. A task force to set up the Friends group, with some library staff members, has been in action, and all staff have been solicited to become members of the Friends. it is not clear in Sept. 1996 whether a board for a Friends group has been set up yet. No report on the Friends has yet appeared in Library Matters, although such a report has been requested. In the meantime, over recent years library staff have volunteered to help with books sales and reading marathon days.

The staff were told of the completion of Mary Holland's surgery in the summer of 1996 in an e-mail, but were not told of her health problem. Her work schedule and plans for future development work are not known yet.

Hornbake Library (Undergraduate Library):

The issue of the place or role and the future role of the Undergraduate Library has been on the agenda of the Libraries almost since it opened in January 1973. The opening day collection was targeted to be 100,000, so a number of duplicate copies of books from McKeldin were transfered, as well as books ordered specifically for undergraduate needs. There was an approval plan for the UGL, and a separate fund so that every title in UGL would be duplicated elsewhere in the system. As the role of the UGl increased, the number of reference librarians increased from 6 to 9 (in 1996 down to 4). Special services included a large vertical file and a women's information center. The paperback reading room obtained requested titles quickly from the Maryland Book Exchange, and the books were given quick color-coded marking (not full cataloging) as a browsing collection.

As time went on the collection was cut back, and it was expected that reference and library instruction would remain, whatever the collection. The Director soon after her arrival announced that the collection would serve only lower division undergraduates. In 1986 she announced that the UGL budget would be limited to 5% of the materials budget (it had been 9.6% in 1981-82). This was to enforce its role as lower division only. Eventually the special funds for the general reading collection was stopped, and all professional journals were cancelled. Reserve room materials were taken from elsewhere in the library system if available, and not purchased. Reserve room purchases were cataloged for the appropriate library, and not necessarily for Hornbake. In October 1986 consultants from ARL did a report: "Library Services for Non-research Users at the University of Maryland, College Park."

In 1988 the AD for PS did a background paper to assist Pease Committee members in reviewing the place of Hornbake in the future. No review was made. In 1989 an ad hoc group chaired by the AD for PS prepared a report, "Proposed Enhancement Plan for Library Services for UMCP Undergraduates." It stated that the use of the Hornbake building should be reconsidered after the addition and renovation of McKeldin. In 1991 Hornbake reference and circulation were put in the new CORE Library Services department. In 1992 Robert Merikangas was assigned to do an evaluation of the Hornbake Library collection in support of Core courses.

Over the years various proposals have been made for the use of Hornbake Library: life sciences library, storage, law and government documents library. It has long been assumed that the reference collections and staffs of Hornbake and McKeldin should be merged.

The stated reason for delaying any decision, or even study, of the future of

Hornbake, is the interest of the faculty in undergraduate services. It was assumed that the Libraries could make no decisions unless strong faculty support could be guaranteed beforehand. When the strategic plan of 1994 was written, it was stated that alternative scenarios for the future of undergraduate services should be developed (by library staff?) by the fall of 1995, and in that semester campus reactions to the scenarios would be obtained, so that a decision then could be made. This was not done. Instead, the new Library Council began discussing the Hornbake question in 1995, continuing into spring 1996, but not systematically. Finally a CQI-format team was appointed by the acting director in the summer of 1996, largely of faculty members, and not including any librarians previously involved with the Hornbake question, to make recommendations by October 1996. It was not expected that specific decisions for the services in Hornbake or the use of the building would be made, but that general parameters for future decisions would be clarified.

After over twenty years of hearing that the UGL issue would be decided in about two years (from a moving now), the staff are understandably skeptical of announcements that decisions will be made at some future time.

Management training and development:

Individual library staff have attended management and supervisory training workshops over the years. As is usual with this kind of program, it is difficult for an individual to introduce systematic changes in the workplace, but individual supervisors have worked to improve their ways of managing.

In the Public Services Division there has been occasional interest in using the good collection of management videotapes in Nonprint Media Services for group training purposes. Most recently, viewings and discussions for individuals have been held, but, again, without sustained effort to introduce the management principles into group deliberations and operations. There appeared to be the intention for the Public Services Committee to view some videos for the improvement of their work together, but this was not carried out.

One of the few systematic uses of training videos has been the use of the Partners videos for training student assistants in good customer service by Hornbake Reference and some other sites.

Personnel administration:

Performance appraisal and Performance Review and Development (PRD):

The Libraries have had a perforance appraisal system, using forms for classified staff and essays for librarians, but it was understood that under that system not everyone did appraisals. For example, it was understood that the Director did not do performance evaluations of the ADs, and did not ask for input from middle managers reporting to them. At intervals the personnel office would issue lists of those employees for whom no forms had been received, with some going back several years. Some supervisors never did carry out the process.

In some situations the AD (as in Public Services) invited those reporting to middle managers to submit comments about their supervisors, but no comments about the AD were invited.

A few years ago the campus commissioned the Mercer company to design a new performance appraisal system. The resulting system involved categories of performance factors and numerical ratings. When supervisors were given training in how to do it, many on campus protested (especially deans, we hear), and eventually UMCP was exempted from using it (other campuses are using it). Instead, College Park asked a professor in business and management, Dr Susan Taylor, to design a new system. While it was under pilot testing and feedback the Librarians' Forum steering committee invited a presentation and provided suggestions. Later another presentation was provided for the staff. When the program moved into implementation, a number of questions were raised, and the Forum sponsored a meeting to identify issues. When these were presented to the personnel officer, Ray Foster, he responded that the ADs saw no problems and that we should go ahead and implement the program. Meanwhile, training in the new PRD process was provided, so staff had a variety of perspectives and expectations. The first year started late and the scheduled mid-year review was skipped. The campus coordinator offered to consult with the Libraries, but the personnel officer continued to maintain that the Libraries had no questions. A meeting of interested staff showed that there were indeed questions, and significant differences in implementation across divisions and departments.

In the spring of 1996 McKeldin Reference invited Marvin Pyles, the campus coordinator, to meet with them to talk about the definition of categories and factors, and the formulation of expectations. Good information and processes were developed of potential interest to other library departments.

Ray Foster is skeptical of the ability of the Libraries to gain enough consistency to apply the PRD to the merit award process, especially since it seems to move toward the inflation of all ratings to "exceeds expectations," just as the ratings in the previous systems moved toward "outstanding" for almost everyone.

Screening and selection committees: There is an expectation that the members of selection committees will be announced. Committees are appointed by the supervisor of the position, apparently. When the Library Assembly was in existence it was empowered to appoint a librarian to selection committees for librarian positions. Usually there are open meetings for those interested in meeting candidates, and the practice has begun of asking candidates to make a presentation to staff.

Departing staff and exit interviews: There have not been systematic exit interviews as understood in the personnel management field, which would gather data for management purposes.

At times when staff are terminated, very little information is given to staff, so rumors abound. It was understood that associate directors were not given regular performance appraisals and their staff were not asked for feedback, but the associate directors for technical services (Carl Hays) and collection development (Thein Swe) and special collections (Don Farren) were asked to resign, apparently because of unsatisfactory performance.

Other staff have been moved from managerial positions to staff or line positions without public explanations.

When staff retire, frequently a party is given. Sometimes these parties are elaborate affairs with testimonials.

Recently the editorial board of Library Matters has tried to have interviews with departing staff so that they can give messages to their fellow workers as they leave, and so the staff can learn what they are planning and what their thoughts and feelings are on parting. An example is the interview with the former head of EPSL, Herb Foerstel. Rick Moul of ITD e-mailed an interview from his new position in North Carolina. Some staff have declined the opportunity for an interview. The departing AD for PS was invited to submit a parting message, or be interviewed.

Staff development: A staff advisory committee was gathered by Ray Foster and Katherine Fitzgibbons in the spring of 1991 to discuss staff development.

After several meetings this initiative was stopped, with no further action.

Staff recognition: A committee was set up to propose a system of staff recognition. Recommendations were given to the Director in Dec. 1991. No action was taken. Finally a staff referendum showed little interest. Don Williams wrote an article in the newsletter suggesting that the director could go ahead and give recognition without a complicated system of committees and categories of awards. No action was taken, until in recent years the awards for years of service have been broadened to include associate staff and the occasion has been taken for a gathering and reception. The campus has a general banquet and award ceremony for years of service. The effort to report on the campus awards to library staff in Library Matters in 1996 came up against problems of getting complete information, and no article was done.

Librarians' merit pay process: The names of those receiving merit awards, or only receiving extraordinary awards, have been published in the library newsletter. Only in the beginning were reasons given: this was stopped immediately because of the outcry. Because of perceptions of unfairness, and the lack of a connection between the merit process and the annual performance appraisal process, a committee was established in 1994 to recommend an improved system. At the same time some librarians who established the Librarians' Forum were doing studies, from the university budget, of patterns in the awarding of merit. It was clear that the higher the rank, the greater the likelihood a librarian would receive a merit award. Awards given to associate directors have never been announced.

For one year, 1995-1996, the new process was applied, with a limit (not defined exactly) of the number of those eligible for awards. Comments from peers were solicited and used. In the year beginning July 1996, awards were announced by the director, for almost all librarians. It was necessary to go through the staff roster to discover those not receiving awards. The differentiation between those receiving extraordinary awards and others was not noted, either in numbers or names, but this could be discovered by an examination of the budgets. The associate directors were again not included in the list, leaving their status as recipients unknown.

What the process will be in the future is unknown, since the PRD should be the basis for merit judgments, but no one has confidence in the accuracy, consistency, or fairness of the PRD process, including the Personnel Officer.

New pay programs: The new ranks and pay program for nonexempt staff went

into effect with FY 1997, and preparations for a new program for exempt staff are underway. The effort to create a separate category of librarian ranks was supported by the UMS library directors, and the Board of Regents, but it remains to be seen how such a plan would be integrated into the general plan for exempt. Once a structure of ranks is created, then a system of market measurements would lead to a new salary structure for each category of exempt staff.

Librarians' status: It has always been assumed (in the modern era) that librarians should not seek faculty status and would not be successful if they did seek it. The privileges of associate staff were supposed to include the opportunity for a paid sabbatical, but it has never been approved. Robert Merikangas applied for one after the possibility was affirmed in an undated version of the Associate Staff manual, but it was denied.

Librarians have not been eligible for research grants, but Frank Shulman, as a member of the Campus Senate Research Committee, has recently raised the issue for discussion in the committee. Robert Merikangas has also testified in the committee.

We have assumed that librarians are not eligible for the teaching development grants from the dean for undergraduate students. Robert Merikangas has served once on the advisory group reviewing the distribution of such grants.

Librarians have been able to teach as faculty for University College (with an automatic overload permission for up to so many hours -- four?-- per semester for College Park faculty and staff). Reference librarians have taught the LIBS 100 course, a course in library instruction, for many semesters. Those presently on the staff who have taught it include Robert Merikangas and Martha Hooker. Librarians have taught other courses for UMUC. Robert Merikangas was hired to write a course (HUMN 396), then to teach it. When he was hired to work as a humanities curriculum specialist by University College he had to obtain permission from the UMCP campus authorities.

Librarians have not been able to teach at College Park (and be paid extra for it) until the spring semester of 1996. Years ago (1985) Robert Merikangas created and taught a course for the Honors program on Nobel Peace Prize

winners, but could not be paid for the work. Librarians have not been given permission to have release time for teaching a course on campus. For example, years ago Martha Seabrook, Humanities reference librarian, was invited to teach a section of an English composition course, but she was not given permission on the grounds that it would interfere with her availability for her work hours. In the past year inquiries were made by the acting director of the Center for International Development and Conflict Management, Edy Kaufman, about the reference librarian, Robert Merikangas, being able to help develop a Nobel-Peace-Prize component of the International Studies College Park Scholars program. It was noted that it would be possible, if the Director of Libraries approved, and the dean of the college approved, and funding were available, but only as a special situation for one semester at a time.

Other associate staff on campus have obtained the position of affiliate professor with departments, so they can teach as an integral part of their positions. For example, Stew Edelstein of BSOS is an affiliate professor with EDPA, and a number of staff in Student Affairs are affiliates with the CAPS department, and teach courses. The possibility of library staff being afffilate professors with the College of Library and Information Services has apparently never been investigated or proposed.

Then in the spring of 1996 the situation had changed. Trudi Bellardo Hahn was given permission to teach a course in CLIS as an overload to her new position in the Libraries.

The new dean of libraries has been given, we understand, a faculty position in CLIS and presumably may teach either as part of his regular position (with no additional salary) or, perhaps, with overload permission, receive additional compensation for teaching a course.

Council of University System Staff (CUSS): This group meets with the chancellor and the staff on the system level to discuss issues involving exempt and nonexempt staff, such as the new pay programs and other matters. Librarians (David Glenn, Robert Merikangas) have run for election in the last two elections, but have not won a seat.

Projects: Staff and management-sponsored

Some of the associate directors have sponsored projects over the years, and

the staff have proposed activities, but often there have been no long-term consequences.

-A Reference Planning Committee in Public Services set up time factors in workweeks and levels of servicein reference, but when the group was ready to move to investigating library instruction and factors involved in quality service it was stopped. There have been occasional meetings to talk about better referrals between service sites. Flora Jones' position (head of General Research Services) was at one time understood to involve coordinating reference service, but the AD for PS did not support any ongoing reference coordination or reference program planning.

-Staff working with computers suggested a user group to share information, but the management response was that it was not needed, and staff could meet on their lunch hour if they wanted to. No group was formed.

A number of departments began working with database management systems, such as In-Magic in McKeldin Reference, dDase (Hornbake Ref and others), Paradox (Nonprint and Hornbake Ref), Pro-Cite (Architecture and others), Quatro-Pro for student assistant pay and statistics (many sites). There has been no general coordination of these uses. There has been a general but not fully articulated staff interest in creating local databases, such as I&R files, common information desk questions (now in rolodexes), expert systems, which could then be made accessible through the online catalog terminals. Provision for such databases was included in the RFP for the present LIMS. One attempt to deliver general information was Joe McHugh's menu-driven PC information files in the lobby of McKeldin. Meanwhile, the campus developed a campus information kiosk system, which has been superseded by the inforM system. Until recently, the Libraries were not able to make the inforM files available in the Libraries, and the Libraries have not coordinated the provision of local information.

Software is ordered through Marietta Plank.

More recently staff in Technical Services have formed WIG, an interest group to share information on Windows and other applications.

-A staff member (Gloria Chawla) spent 18 months preparing a report on how to deal with nonbibliographic databases. A report was given to the director, Jan. 5, 1989. A group was formed June 26, 1989 to "coordinate nonbibliographic database service." Attention was given to bibliographic control, collection development guidelines, user services. A draft of April

30, 1990 was "User Services Policy Statement for Nonbibliographic Databases." As the growth of materials has increased in recent years, it has appeared that this earlier work was either not brought to completion or forgotten.

-A staff group was assigned by the AD for PS to develop pilot expert systems using FirstClass software (after the NAL model), which they did, and then they recommended that a group be set up for implementation and continuation of the development. No follow-up action was taken. The AD for PS made a presentation at a conference about the project.

-The AD for PS set up a pilot database consultation system. Ray Foster consulted with the Marjis program.

-How to deal with software has been a continuing concern. A Committee on User Services for Software gave a final report October 1, 1989: "The Committee recommends that long-range planning consider a centralized Library facility for software and hardware." The question was what to do with software and books coming with diskettes. The issue came up again frequently.

At present, software is held at reserve desks or circulation desks for loan. A message with the cataloging record should indicate the location. No equipment is provided for use in the Libraries. There has been no systematic acquisition of software. Faculty who have wanted to place a disc on reserve for use in the library by a class have reported frustration (see Dr Noel Myricks, and his attempt to make the program "Objection!" available to the Mock Trial class).

-Fee-based search services: This kind of service has been investigated by staff under the direction of the AD for PS from time to time, specifically for a period of time by Maureen Schumacher of McKeldin Reference. No program has been developed.

-Nonprint production: Nonprint Media Services has engaged in a number of successful cooperative projects, such as the production of a forestry videodisc with NAL.

-Cooperative projects with NAL: a project of microfilming agricultural projects was completed, and a text digitizing project was begun.

-A committee, chaired by Betty Day, was set up to deal with the problem of missing pages in books and journals in the collection. No public report seems to be available.

-Checking-in of serials was centralized in Serials Acquisitions in March 1992. The check-in record appears in VICTOR. Many sites continued to do local kardex check-in because of concern for missing issues.

-DIALOG user education project: with the requirement that the Libraries provide training for DIALOG users, a group was formed to plan for this, with Ray Foster in charge. The plan for a tutorial was not achieved, so workshops were eventually set up.

-Publication of an index to the campus newspaper, Diamondback: Hornbake Reference started an index and continued it for many years. The project was stopped in spring 1994. The Archives has announced the intention of resuming the indexing.

-A program of working with local high schools led to discussions with the campus staff working with school-college collaboration. After an assistant provost met with the Director, the AD for PS took over the planning of the project, and decided to create a video to be used by the high schools. The video was created, found not to be suitable, it seems, and no further programing was done.

-For many years documentation and training for staff using the online public catalog was handled by a committee chaired by Danuta Nitecki, then by Paula Hayes in her place. When a change of focus was needed, the group recommended a clearer focus and new members. Danuta Nitecki announced that she would create the new group. No action was taken, and the previous group ended.

-The AD for PS for years planned a new service setting, eventually called the Electronic Reading Room. A contract was arranged with McQueen Associates to set up a number of servers for a local area network and about 50 Macintosh and IBM computers on the fourth floor of McKeldin. After the renovation of McKeldin this room was announced on signs as "Public Use Computers." The staff learned about the facilities when the room was reported in a program in spring 1996. At that point it became necessary to

consider questions of purpose, selection of electronic files, and staffing, which apparently had not yet been dealt with. Since no additional funding and no staff lines were designated for the new service setting, although some possible functions for the setting were indicated in the cooperative possibilities in the strategic plan, it was necessary to make arrangements quickly so the room could open. Finally the room was opened to the public in the spring of 1996, with a schedule of Monday through Friday, 2- 6 pm (the hours were reduced to 2-5 during the summer without public announcement). Staffing was by student assistants. The new position of telecommunications engineer, held by Eddie Hou, was assigned the responsibility of setting up the computer files on the LAN. A process was initiated to hire a manager of electronic information services. Betty Day, a bibliographer, was appointed to this position. effective Sept. 3, 1996, with the announced title of manager of Electronic Information Services. The position was announced: "coordinates the services offered through the Electronic Information Center." It remains to be seen how this setting-based service is related to the electronic files in general, which are made available in many other settings and for remote users. The telecommunications engineer who handles the hardware and software does not report to the manger of EIS, but reports directly to the AD for PS. (The position of telecommunications engineer was designated to allocate about 60% of his time to support of stand-alone and LAN public workstations, library instruction workstations, and divisional staff workstations).

In the meantime the question of what the room should be used for was addressed by the members of Electronic Resources Review Committee (ERRC), chaired by Betty Day. A philosophy for electronic resources was written (and not released until Bob Merikangas inquired of Desider Vikor what the status of the statement was, in August 1996). A list of possible computer files was prepared, and it was then discovered that for most files which had been on stand-alone workstations in reference areas it would cost more to put them on a network such as the new LAN. It became necessary to calculate the costs, and investigate what might be possible. It was possible to put the free government depository titles on the LAN, but the limited space on the LAN precluded filling it with government publications (so many such CD-ROMs were shelved in the office of GOVDOC). Bibliographers began purchasing full-text databases for access in the ERR. A program was begun in the summer of 1996 of putting reference titles on the LAN so that usage (and no-access attempts) statistics could be obtained, and eventually decisions could be made on which titles should have network access for more than one

simultaneous user.

The possibility of making access to LAN titles available to dial-in users was postponed.

Bibliographers and reference librarians began talking in the late summer of 1996 about the use of the ERR, and who might provide service to the titles there. There was a move toward a policy that all sites should provide full access to LAN titles, and not limit access at their site only to those of direct interest to them.

Since the Libraries web site was made available on the LAN, and thus available in the Libraries for the first time, the question of possible Internet use by patrons (in the ERR and at all reference sites, and even at all VICTOR terminals with EIC access) to the exclusion of the use of campus resources became significant, and staff started to discuss it informally in Sept. 1996. Should any kinds of priority use be established for library workstations?

Numerous other questions began to occur, and the need for some kind of forum for deliberating and deciding about electronic services was increasingly being identified. Catalog Management (Arlene Klair) found a need to have some way of getting decisions about location codes for the new sites, and policies on cataloging computer files and related documentation.

-The AD for PS set up an ad hoc group in 1995 on Services Amidst Technological Change. Members: Danuta Nitecki, chair, Betty Day, Judy Erickson, Joe McHugh, Terry Sayler, Phil Vandermeer (called themselves the SWAT team). A meeting for staff was held on Nov. 1, 1995, with this agenda:

"The group will summarize its early efforts both to identify major issues to be addressed this semester and to propose a menu of services with targeted customers which we might realistically offer during the next 3 to 5 years." The menu listed possible services in benefit/cost categories, and staff were invited to place colored dots on them.

One major issue was the replacement of public printing by other systems.

There was no visible follow-up to this forum, and apparently the group stopped meeting and planning for future services.

Some staff (such as Bob Merikangas) submitted written comments for their deliberations, but received no acknowledgement.

<u>Public Services Division organization and communication issues</u>:

Communication Survey (1987-1988): As a follow-up to a comment in the Costabile Associates report of 1987, Danuta Nitecki did a survey of Public Services librarians about meetings in the division in Nov. 1987. The results

were reported in a memo "Responses to Communication Survey" dated Jan. 20, 1988. The 1 to 5 ratings were totalled, and written comments were listed. The AD stated: "I'll also pursue a suggestion to offer training in conducting meetings as a staff forum." There was no follow-up on offering training in conducting meetings.

Communication Audit by Dr Jeffrey Anderson, Speech Communication (Spring 1994): Having a problem using the library, Dr Anderson walked into the office of the AD for PS, and in the ensuing conversation volunteered to use the students in his organizational communication class to do a communication audit of the Public Services staff in the spring of 1994. A form was distributed to staff, and many staff were personally interviewed. The results were being compiled and not yet fully interpreted when Dr Anderson left to go to the University of Montana. The staff heard nothing of the results until Danuta Nitecki, on request, released a summary to Anne Turkos, the leader of the CQI Team on Internal Communications, with a memo on Feb. 24, 1995.

If he had stayed, Dr Anderson could have been of assistance in working out ways to implement the recommendations in the study. As it was, the study did include recommendations, but these were not revealed to the staff nor acted upon. Some excepts from the summary:

-"Staff participating in the study, in the spring of 1994, emphasized a desire for more frequent, timely, and informative communication with supervisors at all levels."

-"An analysis of the library system's corporate culture reveals it to be 'very bureaucratic', according to the report. 'The current climate within PSD appears to be far from supportive especially as employees relate to top management', concludes the audit report, submitted in July 1994."

Role of the Public Services Committee:

The Public Services Committee has consisted of department heads and some unit heads, and at times there has been an understanding that other Public Services staff may attend. The understanding is that the decision-making body is those who report directly to Danuta Nitecki. Some branch librarians would attend regularly, others not. Heads of reference would usually attend, but heads of periodical units not. Heads of Circulation in EPSL, Hornbake, and McKeldin attend.

In the spring of 1995 the AD gave PSC a diagram showing a proposed new organizational structure for the division, involving various teams and groups. There was no detailed information on how the teams and groups would

operate and relate to departments and units. The implication seemed to be that each group would have a charge from the AD, for a given time period, as for the previous "quasi-CQI" teams. It so happened that the AD took a long overseas vacation during the summer, and PSC met several times in her absence, with a particular interest in discussing the organization of the division. The chair for one meeting was Herb Foerstel (whose coming resignation had been announced), and Anita Carrico chaired the one of July 19, which led to major agreements. The results of the deliberations were reported to the AD at a meeting on her return (see minutes in August, 1995).

A summary of some of the agreements of PSC members in the absence of the AD:

-PSC could not identify the problems or issues the proposed re-organization was intended to address; the AD should be asked to clarify the needs and how the plan would address them. Without such clarification, PSC could see no reason for the changes.

-PSC members as middle managers should seize the initiative to become involved in major issues facing the division, and the mode of operation of PSC needed to be addressed. Some of the major issues which PSC wanted to deliberate about:

-Hornbake/undergraduate library services

-the development of electronic resources and services

-issues with Collection Management need to be addressed

-filling staff vacancies, such as the role of the proposed User Education Coordinator

-ways to increase the participation and responsibility of PSC in the decision making process, along with clear leadership by the AD

-the PSC meeting format: the meetings should be conducted with an improved atmosphere

It was agreed that PSC itself had to learn to operate with a more participative role before consideration be given to starting any other groups or teams.

Because of the value of meeting without the AD, such meetings should be held periodically.

What has happened since the summer meetings? PSC members might well give various stories, but it appears that:

-the AD expects PSC members to submit agenda items, and has not attempted to articulate a vision of the primary needs of the division

-the use of the meeting to share information items has stopped

-there have been no additional meetings without the AD

-there have been no efforts to improve the conduct of the meetings, and members continue to complain about the way discussions and deliberations are led by the AD

-the idea to work with Collection Management led to an invitation to the AD for CM and SC to attend a PSC meeting, but he declined to respond to such a summons

-there has been no effort to try a "team" approach with PSC, nor has any group been appointed to monitor the possible improvement of PSC operation

-PSC was not consulted in defining the position of manager of User Education Services, nor in the assignments given to the person (Trudi Bellardo Hahn) who was hired

-PSC was not consulted in the development of electronic resources and the planning of the LAN, nor in the role of the Telecommunications Engineer (Eddie Hou) hired to operate the LAN and support computers in the division (he reports to the AD)

-PSC was not involved in the move by the Director to assign planning for underlibrary services to a faculty CQI project team (with some library representation)

In general, it does not seem that PSC and the AD were been able to deal directly with their different perspectives on managing the work of the division.

The issue of working with service sites in other divisions has been raised in the context of the User Education planning and is also involved in the access to the EIC. At one period of time there was an attempt to improve communications and cooperation with Special Collection service sites by inviting Peter Curtis, then head of the Maryland Room, to attend PSC meetings. He did so before he resigned, and the practice has not been resumed with his successor.

In 1996 the branch librarians, who had been meeting at intervals, decided to invite others, such as the manager of User Education and representatives of McKeldin Reference and Hornbake Reference, to a meeting about reference issues. The group decided to continue, as the RIG, and invite others to future meetings as guests. In Sept. 1996 the head of the Maryland Room attended.

Relations with other campus libraries and collections:

Relations with libraries of campus departments: Some departments on

campus have well-organized libraries, staffed by librarians, and others have more informal collections. In the early 1970s the Serials Department handled the orders for periodicals for the campus departments, then turned the responsibility for the orders over to the departments. At one point also the assistant to the director (a librarian position that existed for a few years) surveyed the campus libraries and created a directory for the use of library staff. More recently efforts have been made from time to time to keep track of the periodicals held on campus, since a number of them are not duplicates of those in the library system.

The departments have always had funds for instructional materials which they can use for whatever they want. When the possibility was raised of considering these funds in connection with the support given to the Libraries, the Senate committee dealing with libraries and the computer center decided not to get into that area, and leave the departments free to do what they want. The departments buy books, audiovisual materials, materials for reserve, periodicals, and, now CD-ROMs. A number of departments have the basic bibliographic database for the discipline in the department (such as PsycLit, Sociofile). Some departments have their own accounts for database searching of systems; for example, perhaps a dozen have accounts for Lexis/Nexis (which is good, since the Libraries educational contract cannot be used by faculty for research).

The larger libraries, open to students, are:

Information Technology Library (formerly Program Library), in the Academic Information Technology Services (formerly Computer Science Center)

Educational Technology Center (the College of Education is considering whether to continue this center as a collection; it absorbed the former Curriculum Laboratory a few years ago. The Curriculum Lab held textbooks, other instructional materials, and at one time, ERIC documents on microfiche).

Space Sciences Library

Behavorial and Social Sciences computer lab: holds databases (in the AITS center)

Psychology test library

There have been proposals from departments over the years that new libraries be added to the library system:

Space Sciences library: this would have merged the astronomy and space sciences collection into a library connected with the EPSL, and books were cataloged for a time for this prospective library. When no new position for a librarian to run it appeared, the project was cancelled, and the books were merged into the EPSL collection, and the departmental library remained.

Geography library: a proposal to add this library to the LeFrak Building when it was being renovated was not endorsed by the Libraries, so the department gave its collections to the Libraries. A cartographic lab, with extensive computer files, is maintained.

Journalism Library: the proposal is apparently still pending, but no staff lines have been allocated for it. It would contain the News-American archives (now in the custody of the Maryland Room, being processed), and journalism-related materials from the McKeldin collections.

Relations with the library of the College of Library and Information Services: The library collections of the CLIS Library (now the Paul Wasserman Library) show in the Victor catalog, and there is nothing in Victor to indicate that the library is anything other than one of the UMCP Libraries. However, because the CLIS library is a part, administratively, of CLIS, and the head of the library does not report to the director, there has been a policy of showing no information about the CLIS library in library informational material. No written information is provided about the location, hours, or services of the library, so library staff have to provide such information, when asked, from staff files or by phoning the CLIS library. Public Services staff have frequently asked for permission to include information about the CLIS library, but the director and ADs have refused.

At present the handout, McKeldin-at-a-Glance, gives the phone number of the CLIS Library, the only such mention of the library.

The CLIS librarian, Bill Wilson, for many years until his retirement and the appointment of Karen Patterson, maintained good communications with librarians in the other UMCP Libraries. CLIS has participated in the serials cancellation projects.

A study of the budgets will show the extent of support for the CLIS library from the college and from the UMCL Libraries, for acquisitions and cataloging.

The CLIS library materials are not charged out using the CARL system, so circulation status is not shown (as for the McKeldin government documents).

Relations with the College of Library and Information Services: The staff have not been aware of any systematic relationships with the College.

CLIS students continue to work in the Libraries as student assistants, and they do field study and practicum work in the Libraries. Numerous library staff have taken courses in the library school and some have obtained the MLS. Of these, some have left the staff to take professional positions elsewhere, some have accepted professional positions here, and some have remained in classified/nonexempt positions after receiving their master's.

Some library staff have attended programs and lectures sponsored by the library school, and some have given talks there (such as Bob Merikangas's presentation on libraries as learning organizations in Sept 1995 for the First Tuesday series) or presented papers in CLIS seminars (such as Bob Merikangas's paper on research interviewing for Gary Marchionini's course on research methods).

The major cooperative project between the UMCP LIbraries, CLIS, and the Computer Science Center, was the design of a bibliographical instruction course. Once created, one section, taught by Dr Marilyn White, was offered several semesters, last in spring 1995. Marilyn White noted copyright protection on all the instructional materials she developed for this course. CLIS hoped to get grant money to hire graduate students to staff more sections of this course, but such funds were not obtained, so the course is no longer being offered. There was some interest in the College Park Scholars program in offering such a library/computer skills course in clusters, as special sections of writing and speech courses are offered.

It has always been possible to invite CLIS professors to work as consultants with the Libraries, such as in projects with their seminars, but such work has been quite rare. One example was in 1974 when Dr Ed Olson and his students in LBSC 825, Introduction to Organization Development in LIbrary and Information Organizations, consulted with the staff in Undergraduate LIbrary Reference. (see The Other Word, staff newsletter, Dec. 1974, p. 14).

Relations with UMS and various external groups:

Relations with UMS and UMS library directors: The meetings of the library directors are not well known to the library staff. The common task of obtaining and monitoring the LIMS seems to have been the primary concern. Specific procedures and decisions are often delegated to UMS task forces dealing with the bibliographic record, circulation, and the PAC features. Now a group is assigned to deal with the successor to the DIALOG database project.

The library directors held an open forum (1995?) to inform staff of issues concern the LIMS and ask for ideas. The directors had set up a grid, with the heading: "Below is a list of the services under consideration by the LIMS Library Directors for the future development of the LIMS services. Please review each item below and prioritize it for your individual library. As a rule of thumb, no more than twenty percent of the responses should be a high priority item." The services provided by ITD were also to be ranked, and all were asked which services are campus-specific and so should not be performed by ITD.

The categories for ranking given were high, medium, and low priority. Since the services were not defined, but only listed under very general terms, and not priced, it was not very easy for staff to make informed priority rankings. At the time of the forum at College Park, apparently the directors had already had a retreat and make priority judgments. Later in 1996 the form appeared again, through the ADs, and staff were again asked to respond. It was never clear to staff, at least those outside ITD, what was happening.

Another major topic of possible interest and action by the directors would be cooperative collection development, but it seems to be admitted that this area is too controversial to negotiate. In particular, the interests of College Park and the other large campuses are quite different from those of the smaller campuses. UMCP Libraries looks more to The Johns Hopkins University and other large libraries for cooperative arrangements.

Meetings of reference staff have been talked about, but have not occurred. Such contacts as have occurred have usually been in the context of the groups of the Maryland Library Association.

Maryland Higher Education Commission: It was announced that "the state's higher education commission will be coming out with an issues paper to solicit responses for a new plan for post-secondary education." "The Maryland Higher Education Commission intends for this plan to address funding, the role of the state's historically black campuses, accountability for performance and remediation issues." Outlook, June 18, 1996, p. 5.

The LIbraries apparently have not yet begun to participate in the discussions on these topics.

Relations with campus governing bodies: The director of libraries has been an ex officio member of the College Park Senate, but has shown little visibility. Membership in the council of deans is significant, and the announced coming membership in APAC (academic planning) is significant, but the staff in

general have been ignorant of any specific developments on the campus level. Campus cooperative planning of computing has been relatively sparse, it seems, although the dean of the library school, Ann Prentice, was given a position apparently designed for coordinating academic and administrative computing.

The new Library Council was designed to connect the management of the Libraries to the campus governance structure, in addition to the direct reporting line to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The Council is the successor of two groups:

the Senate committee on Instructional Resources (where the libraries and computer center were the main entities to be coordinated)

the Faculty Library Advisory Committee.

For a history of these groups, see their minutes. Often they were concerned with specific issues, such as the location and services of the graduate reserve room in McKeldin.

The director met with the Senate committee, but with little continued effect over the years. What was done would depend on the initiative of the chair.

The Faculty Library Advisory committee began taking more initiative as the Libraries began developing a strategic plan, and eventually moved to take the director off the committee, so they could meet without her being present.

Over the summer of 1992, an ad hoc working group of the Senate, chaired by Gerald Miller, investigated the situation of oversight of the Libraries, and concluded that more oversight was needed. A group had met earlier to look for solutions, and had recommended the new council approach. This was described as follows:

> "In the summer of 1991, following a year in which considerable attention was paid to the issues of a graduate reading room and the use of movable stacks in McKeldin, an *ad hoc* group took the initiative and began to rehink how the campus could deal with library issues in a more integrated and effective manner than through separate Senate and Provostial committees." (Memo from Summer '92 "Councils" Working Group, 2 Nov. 1992)

The plans were presented to the above two committees, who discussed them, and eventually a set of by-laws for a new type of council was created, of which a library council would be one. Once the concept was approved by the Senate, of having a body of senior faculty serving three-year terms, with some library representation (not including the director), the members of the

first council had to be appointed. Appointments represented the Senate and the Provost and the Director of Libraries. The library staff senator was later added as an ex officio member.

In the first year of the Library Council (1995-1996), under the chair Gerald Miller, the library staff received almost no information of their activities. It was understood that they were concerned with supporting increased funding for the libraries, and beginning to investigate the issue of Hornbake and services to undergraduates. There seemed to be no annual report, as is the custom for Senate committees, but it was realized that this was not, strictly speaking, a Senate committee.

Relations with local consortia and library organizations:

Association of Research Libraries (ARL): The staff in general were not informed of any activities involving ARL.

Palinet: Technical Services handles OCLC relationships in the Palinet context, apparently, and information about Palinet continuing education programs is made available to some of the staff.

Maryland Library Association (MLA): The top management of the Libraries were not visible in MLA groups and activities. Some librarians were active, and attended annual conferences and programs. Some examples: Arlene Klair with Technical Services Division, Bob Merikangas (as president of ARLD, organizer of BIIG, organizer of poster sessions at annual conferences, member of Crab board, etc.), government documents librarians in Documents division. When Rebecca Jackson was coordinator of library instruction she was active in the Bibliographic Instruction Interest Group.

Congress of Academic Library Directors in Maryland (CALD): As far as is known, the director of libraries did not participate in this group.

Consortium of Washington, DC, Universities: The only library connection is the arrangement for library privileges for students who are enrolled in consortium classes on a campus of a participating university. There have been discussions but no participation in online catalog and storage facility projects.

DC Library Association: Some librarians have participated and held office in this association.

Other groups: librarians have participated in the Potomac Technical Processing Librarians group, local chapters of Special Libraries Association, attended the annual Spring conference.

In January 1984, Bob Merikangas chaired a regional bibliographic conference for librarians of DC and Maryland academic libraries.

Special services based in the LIbraries:

Judaica Reading Room: The issue of the creation of a separate library or room for Jewish Studies has a long history. Supporters of Jewish Studies have contributed funds for materials over the years. The decision was made to move all Jewish Studies materials to McKeldin (all have been moved except reference materials in Hornbake Reference). A room was designated the Jewish Studies room on 2M (off the main stairs) and so labelled in the renovated McKeldin. A location code was created so that materials could be shelved in the room. As of September 1996 there has been no official announcement of the opening of the room, and materials identified by the bibliographer for transfer to the room have not yet been processed. Dr Bernie Cooperman met with the DSG in Sept. 1996 and there was agreement on the limited scope of the room, with no staff being provided, but some group reservations possible.

Marjis room: For several years the large room on the first floor of Hornbake, now occupied by the room for services to those visually impaired, was given for the use of the program connected with the College of Education, Marjis, Maryland and Japan in the Schools. This program provided resources for teachers teaching about Japan in Maryland schools. It was never clear to staff why this program was given this space.

Samuel Gompers papers: The editorial offices for the publication of the Gompers papers are located on 4M of McKeldin Library.

Services to those who are disabled: A room for service to the visually handicapped has been located in Hornbake for years, with a Kurzweil added to a VisualTek. A librarian was assigned to work with patrons who are visually impaired, teach the use of the Kurzweil, and coordinate library services with the campus Disabled Student Services and other groups. After John King died, a selection process was carried out for a replacement, but no satisfactory candidate was found. The AD for PS decided to appoint Deborah Stefany of McKeldin Reference to a part-time service role on a temporary basis, and handle general policy and liaison responsibilities herself.

Staff and user suggestions and complaints:
The CQI team on internal communications recommended a system of encouraging and using staff suggestions, but this kind of program has never

existed in the Libraries. At present there is a box in Technical Services labelled staff suggestions, but outside of that division there is no knowledge of the meaning of that operation. Very few suggestions are deposited in the box in Technical Services.

The Associate Director for Public Services has encouraged service desks to have a form for complaints and suggestions, which are to be forwarded to the Public Services office. On one version of the form, users are told that they will receive a response if they include an address. Usually the form has been delegated to the appropriate unit to formulate a response. Responses might affirm and justify the present policy, indicate that the matter will be looked into, indicate that changes will be made, etc. The suggestions have at times been taken to deliberative forums for consideration.

In recent years there has been an effort on the director's level to solicit suggestions from users. The sign over suggestion boxes in McKeldin and Hornbake libraries, for example, states:

> "Your suggestions will be reviewed by the Student Advisory Council and the Library Administration. Please give us your suggestions, complaints, and compliments so that we may work to improve the Library's facilities and services on your behalf."

The student advisory board has not been formed for some time. The AD for PS has prepared and posted written responses to the user comments. The most recent (as of Sept 1996) is dated Jan-Feb 1996.

Staff organizations: Over the years a number of staff organizations have come into and passed out of existence. In September 1996 there are no staff organizations.

Library Council: This group of middle managers existed in several forms over the years, with the ADs usually not participating. In its latest version it included a broad range of middle managers meeting with the director. Proposals were prepared and round robins at meetings promoted the sharing of information between divisions. The director asked the Council to make recommendations concerning library security. In 1991 the group felt that its recommendations were not being given sufficient attention, and asked Dr Harrar for a clearer role, and some assurance that its work would receive serious attention and a response. The director was not willing to give an assurance, so the group ceased in 1992, without any formal announcement to

the staff. This occurred shortly after Robert Merikangas left the Council in April 1992, when he left the position as head of Hornbake Reference and turned the chair of the council over to the vice-chair, Herb Foerstel.

Staff Alliance: This was an organization of all staff. It sponsored programs, social events, and the staff newsletter, "The Other Word." Lack of support and lack of staff willing to run for office led to its cessation.

Classified Staff Personnel Committee: this group met for a number of years to discuss personnel issues, and provide a channel of communication. The personnel office stopped inviting such a group.

Library Assembly: This was the organization of professional librarians. It began as a group chaired by the Director, Howard Rovelstad, but librarians urged the changing of its by-laws to provide for election of officers. As an elected group it had an official role in appointing members of selection committees, disbursing travels funds for local professional development programs, and meeting with the personnel officer to discuss issues. A number of reports were prepared supporting career advancement for librarians. The by-laws were revised in the spring of 1991, then a survey was conducted "on the future and by-laws of Library Assembly" on July 19, 1991. Apparently the results were disappointing and nothing else happened. Arlene Klair was the last officer in place after Rebecca Jackson left the Libraries.

Librarians' Forum: A few years ago a number of librarians were concerned with the lack of a librarians' voices in issues such as merit pay and other personnel issues and general matters of communication and participation in management. A small group gathered and obtained a vote of confidence from the librarians to act as a steering committee. The first chair was Robert Merikangas, who was succeeded by Ellie Wackerman. Forums were held to gather ideas about improving communications (Sept. 24, 1994), on the PRD (Dr Susan Taylor was invited to give a presentation), etc. Initiatives were addressed: a staff newsletter and an expanded staff directory. At the same time the CQI Team on Internal Communications was getting underway and a special committee was created to recommend an improved method of allocating merit pay awards. Minutes of the steering committee were sent to the staff on e-mail.

After two years it appeared that additional librarians were not available

and willing to volunteer to serve on the steering committee to replace those leaving, and a general staff meeting was held at which the primary conclusion was the decision to set up a general staff association. The names of those volunteering for such an association, which had been recommended in the CQI Team on IC report, were given to those volunteering. The three subsequently decided that there was not enough interest to continue. No report was given to the staff, beyond the report by Robert Merikangas that he was turning the names over for follow-through.

The expanded staff newsletter project was taken over by the new board, and the expanded staff directory project stopped when it was announced that the Personnel office would not support it. There were plans announced by Bob Merikangas to publish sections of a staff directory, such as listings of groups and committees and liaison persons, as supplements to the newsletter, Library Matters. In September 1996 he announced that he was listing groups briefly, but he felt that such a full directory should be prepared by assigned staff as a formal responsibility.

Staff publications: For years the official newsletter for staff was the Library Record. In addition, for a number of years the Staff Alliance sponsored a staff organ, "The Other Word." After a pattern of publication every payday, when Don Williams stopped being the "temporary" editor of the Library Record, it went to once a month. With the hiring of Frank Boches as staff editor by the development office, a regular staff member was no longer editing. From the actions of the Librarians' Forum a new staff-edited newsletter was created, named Library Matters as a result of a contest (the winner won $100). The first issue was in October 1995. The editorial board has representatives of each division (position from ITD vacant in Sept. 1996), and Frank Boches no longer handles the production. Two of the editorial board members, Bob Merikangas and Ellie Wackerman, were on the steering committee of the defunct Librarians' Forum.

With the departure of Ellie Wackerman in October 1996, and the intention to replace Bob Merikangas at the same time by a new Public Services representative, the newsletter faces a critical time. There have been requests that the newsletter monitor and report on the follow-up on team recommendations, but this has not been implemented. This project would be made easier if there were an understanding that those involved in implementations would make regular reports.

INTERPRETATIONS AND QUESTIONS THAT ARISE FROM REFLECTION ON THE HISTORY:

Obviously, as in any history, the brief history in the previous pages is based on interpretative judgments of what is and is not significant, and incorporates interpretation of the meaning of events. In what follows, I add more specific interpretations and recommendations and questions based on them.

1. The work of the Libraries goes on: acquiring materials, cataloging them, assisting users. How can management help the staff doing this work? How can management avoid doing things or requiring activities that not only do not help the staff, but actually interfere or take time that might better be given to value-added work?

We might ask the staff, periodically, about the past six months or so: what has management done that has helped? What has not helped? What has caused problems or wasted time (useless work)? What have staff reasonably asked for that would help work and has not been provided?

We have found it difficult to talk about improving "management." We have used the word "communication" in most cases, and then tried to move from communication to management issues, often without success. Those in management have been understandably reluctant to have open, or private, discussions about their effectiveness as managers, and when surveys have revealed problems and suggested areas for improvement (such as the running of meetings), little has been done.

The most systematic efforts dealing with management have been strategic planning and the CQI programs. We have not seen any systematic efforts to use the strategic planning documents to guide management actions. The CQI program in its orientation modes indicated that it should be applied to systematic efforts to improve operations by those involved in those operations, but the teams so far have been composed of those not actually involved in the operations, who make recommendations to others. The general implications for management of the CQI mentality and methods have not been addressed. The terminology of TQM, total quality management, includes the concept of management. The terminology of CQI, continuous quality improvement, separates management from the process, and, as we have seen, often leads to project teams which prepare reports, not to actual work on present systems of service. The real application of CQI to the improvement of library systems has not yet begun.

In September 1996 there is no discernible presence of CQI in the

operations of the libraries, but there is the memory of a number of teams which prepared reports which have not been implemented.

2. Some libraries as well as other organizations have found the paradigm of "the learning organization" and the disciplines connected that that model useful. A learning organization examines systems and looks for points of leverage to make significant improvements, and also is willing to learn from errors and mistakes.

Some questions for management:

-what will be the composition and role of the top management group?

-what will be the hierarchical organization of the Libraries?
-what will be the organization of public service sites?
-what will be the role/place of the present public service sites in Hornbake Library: circulation, reserves, information desk, reference desk, periodicals, services to those with disabilities?

-how will the subject specialists now in Public Services and Collection Management and Special Collections be organized in relation to collection development, reference service, user education, and communications and consultations with faculty?

-how will the Information Technology Division as a service facility be related both to its UMS constituency and to the UMCL Libraries' departments and units?

-how will the body of professional librarians, and professional staff generally, be involved in and participate in management?

-how will the staff as a whole be involved in and participate in management?

-how will the work of the many library staff who have liaison, service, advisory, and governance roles in relation to the campus community be coordinated?

-how will the role of the Library Council as an oversight body be developed in relation to the management of the LIbraries?

-how will the Libraries relate to the College of Library and Information Services and to the CLIS library?

-how will the Libraries relate to Academic Information Technology Services (aITs), formerly the Computer Science Center, and to the groups concerned with academic computing planning and decision making on campus in the UM system?

It seems that have we not learned some management skills over the years, that we might put on an agenda for learning:

-how to deliberate wisely on policy and planning decisions

-how to hold the associate directors (or any top managers) accountable for their managing

-how to encourage and respond to staff ideas and initiatives

-how to bring library users systematically into the generation of ideas and the deliberation process

-how to move the libraries into being convivial tools for learning and problem solving, instead of being tools often difficult to handle

-how to identify the most important "value-adding" processes and functions of the Libraries

-how to provide clerical support for professional positions, so that librarians do not spend large amounts of time doing clerical and technical tasks, especially those connected with computers (document preparation and equipment maintenance)